

From stones to gendered bodies: regional differences in the production of the body and gender in the Copper Age statue-menhirs of northern Italy and the Swiss Valais

Susanna Harris, Kerstin P. Hofmann

Abstract

Much research has been carried out on identifying gendered iconography on statue-menhirs, this paper seeks to develop this perspective by considering the broader body concepts. Body concepts are of interest to archaeologists because they are closely connected to issues of sex, gender and age. By investigating stone sculptures however, we are looking at an ideological view of the body that was produced by reducing the stone from its natural form into a statue-menhir. The presence of bodily features on the statue-menhirs suggests that it was important to construct a body, and that certain aspects of the body were chosen to be represented either through the size and shape of the stone or iconography, while others are neglected. We propose this is a significant means by which stones were made into bodies and gendered beings. To investigate body concepts we pose two questions: how is a statue-menhir body made? And how is it gendered? By following the reduction sequence of the stone as the technique of production we investigate which bodily features were important in constructing a body and in gendering it. We seek to do this through analyzing and comparing three regional examples of anthropomorphic statue-menhirs: 1) Lunigiana group A and B in northwestern Tuscany and Easternmost Liguria, 2) Atesino group in Trentino-Alto Adige and 3) Sion Type A and in the Swiss Valais, Switzerland and Aosta Style I in Aosta, northern Italy. Although there is a shared statue-menhir tradition in the three regions and beyond, the observations in this paper suggest that the bodily gender categories were negotiated regionally.

Keywords: *statue-menhir, gender, body, Copper age, Northern Italy, Switzerland*

Introduction

It is widely held that the statue-menhirs¹ of Late Neolithic / Copper Age Europe are local manifestations of an interregional phenomenon whereby stones were carved to represent real, supernatural or mythological men, women and children (for example, De Marinis 1994a; Gallay, 1995: 180–87; Pedrotti, 1995; Mezzena, 1998b: 14–20; D’Anna, 2002a). The coexistence of interregional and local features within the regional manifestation of statue-menhirs is discussed by these and other authors, as indeed are other aspects of material culture (see also Harrison & Heyd, 2007: 130–33; Fedele, 2013; Pedrotti & Tecchiati, 2013: 222–25). Research into the gender of Copper Age statue-menhirs of northern Italy has focused on identifying male, female and unidentified or asexual categories (Ambrosi, 1988: 22; Mezzena, 1998a; Pedrotti, 1998; Favre & Mottet, 2004: 36; Heyd & Harrison, 2004: 148–49; Casini, 2008; Corboud, 2009; Casini & Fossati, 2013: 168–74; Pedrotti & Tecchiati, 2013: 223–24) as well as theorizing gender status, social roles and relations (Whitehouse, 1992; Robb, 1994; 2009; Barfield, 1998, Casini & Fossati, 2013: 168–74). Typically these research papers recognize gender through the presence or absence of attributes (motifs), plus the presence or absence of breasts, in some cases also stone size and shape (Pedrotti 1995b, 31–33). This paper seeks to develop this perspective by considering whether there were specific gendered body concepts by posing two questions: how is a statue-menhir body made? And how is it gendered? This will be investigated by considering the reduction sequence of the stone itself, from the selection of stone size, through shaping its contours and breasts to the finer reductive techniques whereby attributes such as face, ornaments and equipment were added. The study will compare the anthropomorphic statue-menhirs of three regional groups² (Figure 1; see Appendices 1–4): 1) Lunigiana group A and B in northwestern Tuscany and Easternmost Liguria, 2) Atesino group in Trentino-Alto Adige and 3) Sion Type A from Petit Chausseur, Swiss Valais, Switzerland and Aosta Style I from Saint Martin de Corléans, Aosta, northern Italy. We answer our research questions specifically in relation to these statue-menhirs and do not intend to generalize beyond this context as our argument is that the articulation of gendered body concepts are cultural- and context-specific and need to be approached on a case-by-case basis (Bolger, 2013: 13).

¹ While recognizing the terminology discussion, we use statue-menhir here as a general, inclusive term as Ruth Whitehouse (1992, 145) and Lawrence H. Barfield (1995, 11) suggested; see further D’Anna, 2002b.

² There are bilingual names (Italian/German) used for the Atesino-Alto Adige statue-menhirs and places. In this case the Italian names are used in the text and the bilingual names listed in the appendix.

We consider only those statue-menhir types or styles with Remedello dagger motifs and hence assume they were roughly contemporary. The engraved Remedello dagger with triangular blade and semi-circular pommel is central to the relative chronological scheme of engravings developed by Raffaele C. De Marinis (1994). Statue-menhirs groups with Remedello daggers include: the Atesino Group; Sion Type A, but not Type B; Lunigiana A and B, but not Type C which are dated to the Iron Age (Ambrosi 1972; Anati, 1981: 31; De Marinis, 1994a: 40; 1994b: 70–77; Pedrotti 1995a: 265–66). While the chronology of Aosta Style I and II are debated, Style I (with Remedello daggers) is considered archaic as opposed to the later, evolved Style II (Mezzena 1998a: 106). Due to the inclusion of Remedello daggers, only Style I will be considered here. In this paper Sion Type 1 and Aosta Style I will be referred as the Archaic Sion and Aosta Group. Following Raffaele De Marinis' relative chronological scheme Remedello daggers are dated to the Remedello 2 phase of the Copper Age, which he dates to 2800–2400 BC (De Marinis, 1994b: 70–74). In his evolution and chronology of the central alpine ideological cycle, Francesco Fedele dates Copper Age 2 (*Rame 2*) to between approximately 2900–2400 BC (Fedele, 2011: 95, fig.7). In Switzerland this period is referred to as the Final Neolithic, contemporary with the Auvernier-Cordé of lake Neuchâtel, dated by Alain Gallay (1995: 180) between 2700 and 2450 BC.

In terms of social geography, these grouping presented here should not be accepted uncritically. The Atesino group classification (Pedrotti 1995b: 14–15, 31–33; Kaufmann, 2012: 17) is useful in that it brings together stylistically similar statue-menhirs within the Trentino-Alto Adige modern administrative province. Its weakness is that it agglomerates several river basins (Valle del Sarca, Val di Non, Val Venosta, Val d'Adige, Val d'Isarco) which may have referred to distinct social geographies in the Copper Age. As a case in point, the Arco and Lagundo statue-menhirs are in different valleys, while the Laces statue-menhir is located in Val Venosta, a valley connected to Valtellina via the Stelvio Pass, which may be considered more closely related to the Valcamonica and Valtellina statue-menhir tradition, or a hybrid of the two (Pedrotti, 1995: 33; Fedele, 2011: 81; Pedrotti & Tecchiati, 2013: 228–29). For this reason Laces will not be discussed further. It has been proposed that the stylistic differences between Lunigiana Group A and B may be due to their geographical location. Group A are found mainly along the course of the Aulella, while Group B are found all along the right bank of the Magra from Pontremoli to Sarzana and Minucciano (De Marinis, 1994b: 43). Although situated in separate valleys, the statue-menhirs of Sion and Aosta form part of

megalithic funerary sites which share a number of cultural and stylistic features suggesting cultural unity (Gallay, 1995: 180).

Singularly or in clusters, most statue-menhirs have been found out of context or reused in later periods, there are only rare *in situ* examples erected in rows. Clusters of statue-menhirs or fragments suggest that they were originally situated in groups, for example the eight statue-menhirs recovered from Arco, Trentino-Alto Adige (Pedrotti & Tecchiati, 2013: 222–23). In Lunigiana seven statue-menhirs or fragments were recovered in the locality of La Pieve Sorano, a row of nine were found *in situ* at Pontevicchio, while eight were redeposited at Gropoli and recovered through excavation (Ambrosi, 1972: 45–63; Ambrosi, 2001: 15; Iardella et al., 2004: 132; Paribeni et al., 2012). Excavation of funerary sites at Saint-Martin de Corléans, Aosta and Petit-Chasseur, Sion, attest to the reuse of statue-menhirs in burial cists. Only at Saint-Martin de Corléans does an alignment of pits containing broken-off statue-menhir bases attest definitively to the original erection of two lines of statue-menhirs (Phase 2b, c. 2750 BC) (Mezzena, 1998a: 94–105). Of four statue-menhir found at Lagundo, A and B were found in a secondary position, while C and D were found together standing in their original position (Ladurner-Parthanes, 1952). These contexts attest to the original erection of statue-menhirs and their occurrence in groups, sometimes erected in rows, while not excluding the possibility that statue-menhirs may have been erected singularly.

In her overview of theoretical approaches to gender studies in Europe over the past 40 years, Ruth Whitehouse (2007: 145) summarizes that these studies are largely based in feminist and gender theory, including theories of identity and embodiment. This tie to social sciences is clearly expressed by Eleanor Scott for whom “gender studies are firmly rooted in the tradition of sociology” (Scott, 1997: 10). Maybe because of this, the bodily aspect of gender has been the most essentialised and least explored area of statue-menhir gender research. Since Michel Foucault proposed that the body has history (Foucault, 1975; 1976), an innocent reliance on the naturally given body is no longer possible and also the biological realities of the body are socially-constructed (Meskell, 1998; Fisher & Loren, 2003: 225). Nevertheless, the phenomenology of the body proceeds from a natural body with cross-cultural and ahistorical properties (see Jäger, 2004: 15–18). In archaeology, despite the criticism of the implicit nature-culture dualism and ahistorical view of the sexual body (Butler, 1990; Moore, 1994; Hodder, 1997), the division of sex and gender has often been retained for analytical reasons

(Whitehouse, 2007: 149; Hofmann, 2009: 135). How then can we combine discursive, phenomenological and archaeological approaches (see Bulger & Joyce, 2013; Budin, 2013)?

Gendered body concept, a theoretical approach

For heuristic reasons we will first turn to a modern western view of the human body. The biologist Anne Fausto-Sterlin (2000) argued in her book “Sexing the Body: Gender politics and the Construction of Sexuality” that human sexuality is best understood not as a dichotomy but as a continuum (in archaeology already Nordbladh & Yates, 1990). The world of experience is, however, dominated by the dualistic division into men and women. It can be argued that humans in comparison to other species display relatively limited sexual dimorphism at all times, although this has varies throughout time and between populations (Larsen, 2003). Nevertheless, in the vast majority of all cases children are born with genitalia – penis or vulva – which can be classified by physical appearance as male or female (Sax, 2002). These external sex organs are part of the primary sexual characteristics (primary sex organs). If we assume the Copper Age inhabitants of northern Italy and the Swiss Valais also defined categories on the basis of the genitalia at birth, then individual gender construction starts at this moment (Lorber, 2000: 55).

Concerning body shape there are no further physical differences between female and male sexed children until the beginning of puberty, although children can be differentiated by gender practice and dress. During puberty sexual dimorphism becomes pronounced as the secondary sexual characteristics appear. For females, breasts are the most obvious and their hips normally grow wider than their shoulders. In males, the body becomes more muscular and the shoulders grow wider than the hips and facial hair develops. On average in any population, males grow taller than females and although there is great variety in individual body shape, males tend to have a more V-shaped torso and females have a curvier torso (Haeberle, 1978: 11–20; 1983: 20–21). As these are all averages there is always an overlap, for example men may grow breasts and women can be taller than men. For this reason, these features are described as sex-typical rather than sex-specific (Trautner, 1991: 326–27).

Body shape and size are affected by exercise, disease and diet, which are influenced by factors we call today environment, socioeconomic status, ideology and beliefs (Stinson, 2012: 592–98). In addition, as children learn to walk, talk and gesture they learn to practice their

gender according to their social group (Mauss, 1936; Lorber, 2000: 57). In an essay on body movement and human communication Ray Birdwhistell (1970: 39–46) called these social behavioral forms tertiary sexual characteristics. This term was introduced to analyze the sexual differentiation of psychological and behavioral traits (Ellis, 1894). Nowadays the genesis of tertiary sexual characteristics is a matter of debate and they are increasingly regarded as culturally determined. Hence, tertiary sexual characteristics overlap with gender (Moitra, 2002: 7). We define tertiary sexual characteristics here as features of the body, which are caused by sex or gender compliant behavior and action. Unlike gender through dress they cannot be changed quickly and may not be an intentional transformation or body supplement. Defined so, tertiary sexual characteristics function as a methodological bridge between sex and gender (Figure 2).

People are able to manipulate and change the appearance of bodies through dress which forms an important part of its perceived reality. Dress, as defined by Joanne Eicher and Mary Roach-Higgins, is an assemblage of modifications and supplements to the body such as clothing, ornaments and items held in the hand (Kuper, 1973; Eicher & Roach-Higgins, 1993). It plays a central role in the modeling and perception of a gendered body (Breuss, 2000/2001: 199) and other social categories such as status, age and social role. Paradoxically clothing frequently hides the primary sexual characteristics (Lorber, 2000: 57) and can alter secondary and tertiary sexual characteristics such as breast and body shape. As well as clothing, gender is often marked by other socio-cultural items. In archaeology weapons are frequently equated with men and jewelry with women. Aside from the problem that cultural and situational differences occur, it must be remembered that artifacts are not only linked to gender, but also to age, marital status and/or social status (see Hofmann, 2009: 144–48). For this reason we will try to avoid strongly connoted terms such as weapons and jewelry and use more neutral ones like equipment and ornament.

To summarize, the contextualized concept of the body is a complex interplay between primary, secondary, tertiary sexual characteristics and all aspects of dress. Furthermore it changes through the life cycle (Sofaer Derevenski, 1997; Gilchrist 2000). By investigating stone sculptures, we are looking at an ideological view of the body whose very presence suggests it was important to construct a body and to gender it in which certain aspects were represented while others were neglected (Rautmann & Talay 2000, 5).

Method

Under the influence of material culture studies and phenomenological approaches (see Pickering, 1995; Gell, 1998; Joyce, 2005; Gosden, 2005; Knappett & Malafouris, 2008), a purely semiotic perspective of representation and the body no longer dominates archaeology, at the same time gender material culture studies aim to analyze “doing gender” (see Sørensen, 2000). Instead of focusing on semantic content, the method in this paper will look at the steps involved in reduction of stone in the manufacture of statue-menhirs. We do not aim to reconstruct the individual production steps for each statue (for material and technical details see Mannoni, 1994; Chelidonio & Mottes, 1995; D’Amico 1995; Gallay, 1995: 176), but we distinguish four reduction steps, while recognizing there may be some fluidity in this process: 1) the stone extraction or selection, 2) shaping of the rough outline, 3) carving high relief features, 4) carving low relief features and engraved decoration. Although it is possible that there was a fifth stage of production using paint (e.g. red paint on Arco III, Pedrotti, 1995c: 48, colour pigments found at Ossimo Anvòia -OS4, Fedele, 2013: 204), we prefer not to draw conclusions in this area. In answering our research questions we do not focus on contextual information, but assume that the statue-menhirs were originally produced with the intention to stand erect in the ground.

Description of reduction steps

Lunigiana A and B

The statue-menhirs of Lunigiana are divided by archaeologists into three stylistic groups (Ambrosi, 1972; Anati, 1981: 31; Ambrosi, 1988: 22–23; Paribeni, et al. 2012). Group A (Pontevecchio) (Figure 3.1) and group B (Filetto-Malgrate) (Figure 3.2) are relatively dated to Remedello 2 on the basis of the dagger motifs (De Marinis, 1994a: 40–43), the main difference between the two groups being head shape.

The statue-menhirs of Lunigiana A and B were mainly made from sandstone. The first stage was to select the rock size. Considering that the lower part of the body was not visible when erected, even the tallest Lunigiana B stones selected were shorter than average adult humans and most are substantially shorter. Taking into consideration the proportion of height and width of complete statues, the Lunigiana A group can be separated into two groups, those less than 80cm high and 35cm wide and those that are taller (Figure 4). The Lunigiana B group clusters close together and shows no clear size groups.

In the second and third step the stones were shaped. In the Lunigiana A group the tops of the stones were rounded and this shape forms part of the head sometimes with stepped shoulders, while in group B the rounded head was separated from the body by a neck leading to angular shoulders and the *chapeau de gendarme* (Italian: *cappello di gendarme*, English: policeman's hat) shape head. The rectangular shaped trunks of both groups can be straight, slightly convex, concave or inverted trapezoid. During the third reduction phase breasts were sometimes carved in high relief; in group A this only occurs once (Moncigoli I), but in group B this feature is more common (Appendices 1 & 2).

In the last step, the Lunigiana statue-menhirs were only carved on the front; the back and sides were left smooth. The carvers added anatomical and dress features including equipment and ornaments. In both groups, collarbone and arms were carved on all stones and separate the head and U-shaped face from the trunk. On the trunk the arms were either bent at the elbow at an obtuse angle or simply curve inwards, the hands nearly meeting across the trunk. Low relief breasts were carved in the same manner as the arms and collarbones, as can be seen on Pontevecchio IX which remains half finished (Anati, 1981: 9, fig. 2).

The dress features are limited to axes, daggers, necklaces and pairs of lateral discs placed either side of the face. There is no definitive indication for clothing. The head shape is distinctive and is not normally considered a part of dress, but it cannot be excluded that this represents a headdress or hairstyle. However, there are no anatomical features such as primary sexual characteristics which could suggest they were hidden by clothing even if we cannot detect this through carved motifs. Lunigiana A statue-menhirs were carved with daggers, mostly on those stones measuring 110cm or above. The Lunigiana B statue-menhirs were also carved with daggers, sometimes these are combined with axes. The Lunigiana B statue-menhirs were also carved with ornaments including necklace and lateral discs. The features carved in the fourth stage reoccur in combinations: breasts and necklace, dagger and axe; lateral discs were combined with all motifs except the axe (e.g. Pontevecchio VIII, Groppoli V, Sorano II). This is contrary to earlier suggestions based on fewer discoveries that lateral discs could be tentatively be described as male because they were associated with weapons (Whitehouse, 1992: 47). However, whenever a necklace is preserved with an upper body, there are breasts, as Whitehouse (1992: 47) suggested. Similarly, daggers never occur with breasts.

The Atesino group

The statue-menhirs of the Atesino group are mostly made from marble (Arco II–VI, Lagundo A–D), although other stones such as schist (Santa Verena) and limestone (Arco I) were also used (Pedrotti, 1995a: 267–74) (Figure 3.3). The thickness of the selected slabs vary substantially, some are more like stone blocks. Based on a simple point diagram plotting height and width of the statue-menhirs, three groups can be distinguished (Figure 5): small ones less than 60 cm high, those between 75–132 cm high and those over 150 cm high, including two well preserved stones which are substantially taller and wider than an adult human (Arco I, Lagundo B).

During the second and third reduction phase the stones were shaped. . Where present, the head shape is a simple rise or curve in the stone top. The shape of the slabs vary, there are rectangular with rounded or triangular top (Arco VIII, Lagundo B, D), convex forms (Arco I, V, VI) and some are shaped like an inverted trapezoidal (Lagundo C, Santa Verena, Termeno). Others have a trapezoid shape with slightly convex sides (Arco III, IV, VII). The rectangular and inverted trapezoid shapes are often taller and are combined with equipment (daggers, hammer, axe). The convex menhirs tend to have high relief breasts although some are worn (Arco III, VII, Lagundo A, Arco IV) The only exceptions are the two small menhirs (Arco VI, Revò) (See Appendix 3).

The fourth reduction phase was the low relief or engraved motifs. Most stones were worked on the front, sides and back. Few anatomical attributes were added: there is a complete lack of limbs (arms, hands, legs) and the face was only added in five cases (Arco I, IV, VI, VII, Revò). Even accounting for fragments and wear the face is not always represented especially on the inverted trapezoidal or rectangular shaped stones with daggers and/or festoon belts (Arco II, VIII, Lagundo C, D, Termeno). Stones without breasts were carved with one or two daggers in the upper body area (Arco VIII, Lagundo C, D) and in some cases large quantities of equipment including various combinations of multiple daggers, axes and halberds (Arco I, II, Lagundo B, Santa Verena, Termeno) were carved onto the taller and wider stones. Ornaments including necklaces were engraved on these stones (Arco I, VI, Lagundo B, Santa Verena and Termeno). Concentric circle pendants on either side of the head were carved in combination with breasts (Arco IV, VII, Lagundo A). Apart from the small statue-menhir from Arco VI with convex shape, the necklaces are found on the stone with multiple pieces

of equipment and sometimes the necklace seems to be combined with a suspended dagger (Arco I, Lagundo B, Santa Verena). There are several clothing motifs. Festoon belts and striped cloaks with side fringes were carved on stones with inverted trapezoid or rectangular shape and equipment; curvilinear upper body garment and typically cloaks without fringe (with the exception of Lagundo A) are on stones with breasts and convex shape.

Archaic Sion and Aosta

The statue-menhirs of Sion Type A and Aosta Style I (Figure 6) were made from a variety of stones including schist, marble, granite and limestone. The first stage was to select the rock size. Only two of the fifteen statue-menhirs are fully preserved³ (Aosta 11, Sion 29). These and the dimensions of the large fragments show that the stones were taller and wider than an adult human.

The second step is shaping the stone. They are slab shaped and some are thin, which is a feature of schist. Where preserved, the head is a small protrusion (Aosta 11, Sion 29, possibly Sion 2). Of the relatively complete statues, seven are inverted trapezoid shape and one (Aosta 13) has a slightly convex shape (See Appendix 4). There is no third phase of high relief engraving in the Sion and Aosta statue-menhirs; there are no breasts.

The fourth reduction step is the low relief and engraved motifs. Their fragmentary state, wear and secondary use make it unclear if this is the full range. Many are only engraved on the front, several are also engraved on the back and sides. Six statue-menhirs were engraved with arms and hands or the remains of these motifs. The arms are long, narrow and bent at a right angle, they are combined with a wide variety of attributes. Four of the seven inverted trapezoid slabs do not have preserved attributes. Several inverted trapezoid were combined with equipment (daggers, axe), pendant necklaces and belts (Aosta double spiral pendant, Sion 2, 14) or equipment and two belts (Sion 24). There is one clear example with multiple equipment: Sion 24 has 4 daggers; and the fragment Sion 16 has two belts and two daggers. The belt motif is usually combined with equipment, the one without equipment and only a necklace (Sion 4) is very worn. Both Aosta 13 and 21 were engraved with a narrow line with suspended fringe around the trunk, and on Sion 27 there is a wider band with fringe below the fingers and arms. This motif can be interpreted as a fringed belt or fringed lower body

³ The dimensions of unpublished Aosta statue menhirs are unknown.

garment. On Aosta 13 it was combined with a diagonal strap and on Aosta 21 with a necklace, neither have equipment. Aosta 13 is a slightly convex rectangular statue-menhir, we have no record of the shape of Aosta 17 or 21 and Sion 27 is only a small fragment.

Discussion

In the following we focus on our two research questions – how is a statue-menhir body made and how is it gendered? While researching this paper we debated the usefulness of the separation of these questions and found it problematic, but enlightening (Table 1). Before considering their reduction process we thought, with the exception of breasts, gender was mostly added after producing the stone body; maybe this is because as archaeologists we focus on gender-linked artefacts. We learned that through the selection of size and shape the idea of displaying different gender categories may have played a role from the first steps of stone selection and reduction. Hence, we looked more closely at body features for possible gender display. We noted: 1) what is important for body construction may, but need not be relevant for gendering the statues; 2) the anatomical and dress features that play a role in one group may be completely irrelevant to a different group. Let's look at this in detail.

First, how is a statue-menhir body made? The creation of a body begins in the first step with the selection of stone size and raw material (Table 1 & 2). While in each area different stone type predominate (the Lunigiana statues were mostly carved from sandstone, while in the Atesino group the preference is for marble) a range of stone types were used in each area and hence stone type is not seen as a limiting factor. Within the archaic Sion and Aosta group schist was often used, which is easier to split and incise than to carve, indeed here step 3 (high relief) is lacking. While the different stone types lend themselves to a greater or lesser extent to ease of carving or shaping, the type of stone need not limit the size, shape or range of motifs, the decision to carve breasts or head shape is in the hands of the maker who can adapt their techniques according to the type of stone. In the Lunigiana groups only the front is carved,

		Step 1 stone extraction/ selection (<i>size</i>)	Step 2 shaping of the rough outline (<i>body shape</i>)	Step 3 chasing high relief features (<i>breasts</i>)	Step 4 chasing low relief features & adding incised decoration
Lungiana Group A	female		(●)	(●)	●
	male			—	●
	unspecific			—	●
	Child male				●
	Child female				●
	Child unspecific				
Lungiana Group B	female			(●)	●
	male			—	●
Atesino	big, over- equipped statue (male)	●	●	—	●
	male	●	●	—	●
	female		●	●	●
	child (male ?)	●	●	—	●
	child (female ?)		●	—	●
Sion/Aosta	over-equipped statue (male)	?	●	—	●
	male		●		●
	male ?		●		
	female ?		●?		●

Table 1. How a stone is made into a gendered statue. The dots ● indicate the steps at which gender category was specified, (●) indicates the features is sometimes but not necessarily present, — indicates that the feature is not present, ? insufficient information.

while in the Atesino group low relief and engraved motifs are on the front, back and sides. However in all three regions the whole stone slab or block represents what we can easily understand as a body. Size varies considerably, not only from region to region but also within a group and even within a site. Whereas the statue-menhirs of Lunigiana are all smaller than an adult, the few well preserved examples from Sion and Aosta are over two meters high and the scale of the fragments suggests this was true for the others. In the Lunigiana group A and Atesino groups we can distinguish small from large statues (Figure 3), which has led to the idea they represent children, but also a display of status might be an explanation. In the Atesino group

	Lunigiana A	Lunigiana B	Atesino	Archaic Sion & Aosta
head	●	●	⊙	⊙
face	●	●	⊙	–
neck	–	●	–	–
collarbone	●	●	–	–
arms	●	●	–	⊙
hands	●	●	–	⊙
Breasts	●	●	●	–
Low relief breasts	●	⊙	–	–
High relief breast	⊙	●	●	–
different body shape (excluding breasts)	□	□	●	⊙/?
different size	⊙	□	●	?

Table 2. Comparison of body characteristics of regional groups. ● dominant feature, ⊙ featured, □ featured but following no discernible pattern, – indicates that the feature is not present, ? insufficient information.

we find additional monumentalized statues, all of which have multiple weapons which we can refer to as over-equipped. The term *Überausstattung* (over-equipment) was introduced by Svend Hansen (2002) following his observation that the large quantity of equipment in a grave from Leubingen could not be explained as functional equipment for one person and is unusual in comparison to most of the other graves. This multiplication of certain types of weapons in graves, hoards and on steles is found from eastern Anatolia to Bretagne in the Copper and early Bronze Age. Hansen (2002: 167) interprets it as a formal means of representation and brings it in connection with mythical exaggeration, although this is not to exclude that this relates to other social categories such as statue, rank or age.

The shape of the statue-menhirs is largely determined in the second and third reduction step and varies within and between the groups. The Lunigiana A and B statue-menhirs all have a roughly rectangular trunk with a defined head and U-shaped face, the Lunigiana B statues have a neck. In the archaic Sion and Aosta group the head is mostly absent, rare preserved examples show it was probably only a small protrusion and most of the slabs are an inverted trapezoid, a shape which is found in the Atesino group where there are also trapezoid convex

and rectangular convex shapes. Breasts as typical anatomical features were added during reduction steps three or four of the Lunigiana and the Atesino group (Table 3). In step four U-shaped faces (eyes and/or eyebrows, nose, chin, no mouth) were more commonly added to the Lunigiana A and B.

	Lunigiana A	Lunigiana B	Atesino	Archaic Sion & Aosta
Size	●	□	●	?
Shape (excluding high relief breasts)	□	□	●	⊙/?
Breasts	●	●	●	–
Arm gesture	□	□	–	?
Face	□	□	⊙	–
Clothing	–	–	●	⊙/?
Ornament	●	●	●	⊙/?
Equipment	●	●	●	⊙/?

Table 3. Comparison of gender characteristics of regional groups. ● dominant gender feature, ⊙ gender featured, □ not a gender featured, – indicates that the feature is not present, ? insufficient information.

statues than to the Atesino stones where they are mostly T-shaped (eyebrows, nose, no mouth). The arms, collarbones and hands are an essential part of the Lunigiana construction of the body, separating the trunk from the head. Arms and hands (not collarbones) are common in the archaic Sion and Aosta group, again added in the reduction step 4.

While the number and variety of artefacts depicted on the Lunigiana statue-menhirs (lateral discs, necklaces, dagger and a dagger with sheath) is rather small, clothing and belts are dominant features on the Atesino and archaic Sion and Aosta statues, with exception of the two little ones (Arco VI, Revò). However, it is possible the Lunigiana statue-menhirs are not the visual representation of nude bodies. Although there are no clothing motifs, the silhouette and missing primary sexual characteristics might be an indication that they were not only dressed with equipment and ornament but also clothed (so also Barfield, 1998: 144).

To sum up, the idea of a body is different in each region. As with stick figures, only a few features are needed to create an anthropomorphic representation and the statue-menhir makers of each area made different choices. Disparities in the size of the statue-menhirs of some groups might be an indication for gender, age and status differences. Whether we interpret the larger statues with over-equipment as important humans, ancestors or deities, depends on our ideas about the prevailing social structure and religion.

Secondly, how was the body gendered? And can we separate our two research questions? Again, we discuss this following reduction steps but interpretation requires observations coming from later phases. Indeed, decoding gender in the visual culture of ancient societies presents great difficulties because gender assignment depends on the viewer's knowledge of cultural signifiers and not all are decipherable by modern scholars (Ascher-Greve, 1997: 437). Perhaps this is why we as archaeologist are so focused on sexual characteristics and gender linked artefacts. Like previous writers, our starting point is sexual characteristics. Among the secondary sexual characteristics, the breasts are most clearly assignable to female sex/gender and we follow this interpretation while acknowledging that in some ancient cultures breasts were also present on males (Ascher-Greve, 1997: 438). In some areas size and shape seem to have played a role in the construction of gender. These features can be influenced by secondary, tertiary sexual characteristics and clothing. Within burial archaeology gesture is investigated with regard to gender (Müller-Scheeßel, 2008; Augstein, 2009). However, although the arm gesture of the Lunigiana and archaic Sion and Aosta statues is different, within the groups it is consistent and not important for gender categories. In the Atesino group there seems to be a gender difference in the representation of the face as not all male statue-menhirs have faces and the female faces look more U-shaped due to the curved line created by the clothing. For further discussion of gender categories we rely on gender-linked artefacts.

Daggers, axes, halberds and hammers never occur on statues with breasts or, where shape seems to be important on those with convex shape. For further discussion of gender categories based on the data we rely on the speculative presupposition that the said equipment is male-typical, as is commonly assumed in the literature (Barfield, 1998: 144; Robb, 1994: 32; Robb, 1997: 49; Whitehouse, 2013: 488).. On the other hand jewelry is sometimes considered female-typical but this generalisation is not applicable here. In the Lunigiana group statues with dagger have lateral discs, in the Atesino group necklaces are worn by over-equipped males and in the archaic Sion and Aosta group pendants necklaces are depicted with daggers. However, in the Lunigiana groups necklaces seem to be restricted to females as do concentric circle pendants in the Atesino group. Beads, likely belonging to necklaces, are frequently found in Copper Age sites of the northern and western Alpine region and southern France, but without any significant gender-relation (Barfield, 2007: 325; 330).

In the Lunigiana group A – with one exception Sorana VII – and in the Atesino group those statues thought to be female are usually smaller than the male statues. In the Atesino group the body shape was important for gender construction: with convex, rounded contours predominantly for female gender and rectangular or inverted trapezoid with equipment for male. Annaluisa Pedrotti acknowledges the importance of size and shape in the Atesino group with large dimensions, equipment and festoon belt as characteristic of male statue-menhirs and a different set of attributes and subcircular section for the females (Pedrotti, 1993: 4, 11; Pedrotti, 1995a: 264). However, in Lunigiana A and B shape seems to play no role in gender representation.

In the archaic Sion and Aosta group it is not easy to distinguish gender categories and the presence of females or asexuals is debated (Gallay, 1995: 178, 188; Mezzena, 1998b: 108; Favre & Mottet, 2004: 36; Corboud, 2009: 19–20, fig. 20). For Aosta the automatic association of weapons with males was criticised by Franco Mezzena as female classical deities and mythical females are also known to be associated with weapons (Mezzena, 1998b: 86), although they also had breasts. There are no primary sexual characteristics and neither beards, nor breasts as secondary sexual characteristics. If we consider the inverted trapezoid shape as a display of secondary or tertiary sexual characteristic the archaic Sion and Aosta statues without further attributes would represent one of three male gender categories: a male on the basis of shape alone, an over-equipped male, and a normally equipped male. The one slightly convex stone is Aosta 13, its shape, the absence of equipment and the presence of special dress elements – diagonal strap on the upper body and fringe in the lower body – may be a hint for representation of another gender category. Whether we call it female or an alternative gender construction is a matter of debate.

When considering the differences in reduction sequence (Table 1) we distinguish three male categories in the Atesino group: tall ones with over-equipment, normal height with one dagger (Arco VIII, Lagundo C, D) which are combined with equipment, festoon belts and fringed, striped cloaks and small one with fringed, striped cloak (Revò). There are female statue-menhirs of normal height with convex shape, breasts, curvilinear garment, concentric circle pendants, and sometimes headdress. Then there is the small statue-menhir (Arco VI) with convex shape, U-shaped face, beaded necklace and belt. Due to the shape it seems to fit in the female category, but the necklace and the belt tell another story. If we argue that the short statues Revò and Arco VI represent children, then it is interesting to see that they are

dressed and perhaps gendered differently. The clothing and ornament gender analysis agrees with Pedrotti's analysis of male, female and child or asexual categories (Pedrotti, 1995a: 259-264). In addition we recognize a large, over-equipped male with a different body concept from other stones. This monumental scale is selected in the first reduction step. The large statues share a similar range of equipment and clothing motifs to other male categories (Arco I, Lagundo B, Santa Verena).

Ruth Whitehouse (1992: 49) has proposed that women are shown by their biological characteristics, and men by accompanying artefacts. This was modified by Lawrence Barfield (1998: 144) who stressed that primary sexual characteristics in the Lunigiana group were not displayed because the statues were clothed and the dagger is a phallic form. On the basis of our research the simple dualisms theorised in structural anthropology that male = culture and female = nature do not seem to apply because body shape and clothing also play a role.

Conclusion

We are possibly so focused on presence-absence data and artefacts in archaeology that we have missed the body in its entire variability. This is the case with the statue-menhirs where the focus has been on gender through breasts, equipment and ornament. Through looking at the reduction sequence of the stone used to produce the statue-menhirs it was possible for us to concentrate on the emerging body. We differentiated four reduction steps. First, the extraction or selection of the stone with an emphasis on the chosen size. Second, the rough outline given to the stone and third, the high relief features which both define the shape. Fourth, the low relief features and engraved decoration which add attributes, but do not change the size or shape of the stone. Furthermore, we have broadened the discussion of gender categories by differentiating between primary, secondary, tertiary sexual characteristics and dress elements (clothing, equipment, ornaments) and so taking into account size, shape and body characteristics, which are quantitative traits that are biologically and culturally affected.

We find it interesting that in many cases the body seems to have been gendered before ornament, equipment or clothing motifs were added, either through size, shape or breasts. It should be noted that the primary sexual characteristics are not shown on the statue-menhirs. The only clear secondary sexual characteristics are the representations of breasts on the statue-menhirs of Lunigiana and Atesino. However, the differences in size and shape can be

interpreted as a display of secondary and tertiary sexual characteristics. In addition dress elements, including clothing, ornaments and equipment, are used to emphasize gender characteristics in all groups.

In conclusion, we cannot realistically separate our research questions “How is a statue-menhir body made” and “How is it gendered?”. Size and shape contributes to the gender construction from the beginning in the Atesino group. While in the Lunigiana group A size may have played a role in the construction of a gendered body, in Lunigiana B shape, modeled by high relief breasts, was crucial. In the archaic Sion and Aosta group, gender could possibly have been indicated by the body shape, with one example of a more convex form, although this remains unclear. Nevertheless, the separation of the two questions and the focus on reduction steps in the creation of the stone body reveals that the statue-menhirs of each region were formed according to their own body concept. While in the Lunigiana group heads, arms and collarbones play an important role, in the Atesino group limbs are not depicted and clothing was more relevant, in the archaic Sion and Aosta group there is a combination of both elements. Gender concepts and hence categories also differ regionally: For Lunigiana A and B breast and daggers are the most recognizable means to gender a stone. In the Atesino group the body shape, face shape and clothing are relevant. The gender categories of the archaic Sion and Aosta group are not easy to distinguish but shape and clothing may indicate a non-male category.

Such a local manifestation of an interregional phenomenon seems to be a general trait of the Copper Age in Europe, as outlined in the introduction. For a better understanding of the gendered body concept in local societies it would be ideal and interesting to reevaluate grave contexts including those with new anthropological data as a complimentary study and examine clothing in more detail. This would be a means to understand if different ways of gendering a body existed in different context or if there were over-arching concepts, such topics could be an avenue for future research.

Acknowledgements

Funding for Susanna Harris’ contribution to this research was received from the Marie Curie COFUND (Co-funding of regional, national and international programmes), DRS-Fellowship COFUND: PCOFUND-GA-2010-267228, held at the Excellence Cluster 264 “TOPOI – The

Formation and Transformation of Space and Knowledge in Ancient Civilizations“, Freie Universität, Berlin. This collaboration formed through the TOPOI network where Kerstin P. Hofmann is junior research group leader. We would like to thank Franco Mezzena for an introduction to unpublished statue-menhirs from Aosta. Thank to John Robb, Sheila Kohring and Kirsi Lorentz for organising the EAA session “Body Categories and Identities, Health and Society in Ancient Europe” in 2012, which formed the basis of this paper. We are grateful to three anonymous reviewers for their comments on an earlier version of the text, Undine Lieberwirth for her help with the distribution map of and Claudia Gerling, Arnica Keßeler and Stefan Schreiber for comments and proofreading.

List of Tables

Table 1. How a stone is made into a gendered statue. The dots ● indicate the steps at which gender category was specified, (●) indicates the features is sometimes but not necessarily present, – indicates that the feature is not present, ? insufficient information.

Table 2. Comparison of body characteristics of regional groups. ● dominant feature, ⊙ featured, □ featured but following no discernible pattern, – indicates that the feature is not present, ? insufficient information.

Table 3. Comparison of gender characteristics of regional groups. ● dominant gender feature, ⊙ gender feature, □ not a gender feature, – indicates that the feature is not present, ? insufficient information.

Appendix 1. Lunigiana A statue-menhirs considered in this study. Measurements of fragments are in brackets, uncertain attributions are marked ?, absent refers to information that is missing due to incomplete preservation, “–” indicates that the feature is not present. Motifs added in later periods are not included in the table.

Appendix 2. Lunigiana B statue-menhirs considered in this study. Measurements of fragments are in brackets, uncertain attributions are marked “?”, “absent” refers to information that is missing due to incomplete preservation, “–” indicates that the feature is not present. Filetto VI, VII, La Spezia I, II and Venelia IV are excluded as they are lost,

Betollito, Caprio, Calice and Talavorno I are excluded as they remain unpublished (Paribeni et al., 2012: 243–44). Motifs added in later periods are not included in the table.

Appendix 3. Atesino group statue-menhirs considered in this study. Measurements of fragments are in brackets, uncertain attributions are marked “?”, “absent” refers to information that is missing due to incomplete preservation, “–” indicates that the feature is not present. Tocelinga/Tötschling, Velturmo/Feldthurns and Laion/Lajen are excluded because they depict daggers of a later typological phase; further Corzes /Kortsch (Dal Rí & Tecchiati, 1995: 34) and Laces/Latsch (Fossati, et al., 2004) are excluded.

Appendix 4. Archaic Sion and Aosta group statue-menhirs considered in this study. Measurements of fragments are in brackets, uncertain attributions are marked “?”, “absent” refers to information that is missing due to incomplete preservation, “–” indicates that the feature is not present.

List of Figures

Figure 1. Distribution map of the statue-menhirs of Lunigiana Groups A & B, Atesino Group and archaic Sion & Aosta (Map Susanna Harris, Kerstin P. Hofmann & Undine Lieberwirth).

Figure 2. Classification of body and dress elements (Diagram Kerstin P. Hofmann).

Figure 3. Schematic diagrams of the front view of statue-menhirs of Lunigiana Groups A & B and the Atesino Group: 1 Lunigiana Group A: a) Pontevecchio VI, b) Pontevecchio VII, c) Sorano VII, d) Pontevecchio III, e) Pontevecchio V. 2 Lunigiana Group B: a) Gruppoli III, b) Gruppoli V. 3 Atesino Group: a) Arco I, b) Lagundo C, c) Arco IV, d) Revò, e) Arco VI (Drawing Kerstin P. Hofmann adapted from 1 a) Ambrosi, 1972: 56–57, b) Ambrosi, 1972: 58–59; c) Paribeni, 2004: 442–43 fig. VI.25.2 d) Ambrosi, 1972: 50–51; e) Ambrosi, 1972: 54–55; 2 a-b) Paribeni et al., 2012, 238–39 fig. 3–4; 3 a) Pedrotti, 1995b: 45 fig. 5; b) Pedrotti, 1993: 9; c) Pedrotti, 1995b: 51 fig. 10; d) Pedrotti, 1993: 30; e) Pedrotti, 1995b: 55 fig 12).

Figure 4. Height and width of the well preserved statue-menhirs from Lunigiana A (Diagram Kerstin P. Hofmann).

Figure 5. Height and width of the well preserved statue-menhirs from the Atesino group (Diagram Kerstin P. Hofmann).

Figure 6. Schematic diagrams of the front view of statue-menhirs of the Sion & Aosta Group: a) Sion 24, b) Sion 2, c) Aosta 11, d) Aosta 13 (Drawing Kerstin P. Hofmann adapted from a) Corboud, 2009: 26-27; 176, fig. 7.1; 28–30; b) Corboud, 2009: 21; 176 fig 7.1; c) Catalogue, 1998: 169 d) Catalogue, 1998: 167; 169).

References

AMBROSI, A.C. 1972. *Corpus delle statue-stele lunigianesi*. Bordighera: Ist. Internat. di Studi Liguri.

AMBROSI, A.C. 1975. *Il museo delle statue-stele Lunigianese. Castello del Piagnoro Pontremoli*. Massa: Istituto Lunigianese dei Castelli (Itinerario 1).

AMBROSI, A.C. 1975/76. La nuova statue stele n.50 "Falcinello" e alcuni appunti sulla tipologia delle statue-stele della Lunigiana e della Corsica. *Giornale Storico della Lunigiana*, XXVI-XXVII (1–4): 206–18.

AMBROSI, A.C. 1984. Su la Statua stele n. 59 "Venelia II". *Archivio Storico per le Province Parmensi*, XXXVI (IV): 47–60.

AMBROSI, A.C. 1988. *Statue Stele Lunigianesi: il museo nel castello del Piagnaro*. Genova: Sagep Editrice.

AMBROSI, A. C. 2001. Il gruppo di Sorano. In: E. Paribeni, ed. *Guerrieri dell'età del Ferro in Lunigiana*. La Spezia: Edizioni Giacché (exhibition catalog Florence), pp. 15–18

AMBROSI, A.C. & CAVALLI, G. 1975. Sopra una nuova statua-stele scoperta a Filetto. *Studi Lunigianesi*, V: 11–15.

AMBROSI, A.C. & CAVALLI, G. 1978/79: Sulla nuova statue-stele n. 52 (Mocrone). *Studi Lunigianesi* VI/VII: 141–45.

AMBROSI A.C. & CAVALLI, G. 1982/83: Sulle nuove statue-stele della Lunigiana. *Studi Lunigianesi* XII/XIII: 143–51.

AMBROSI, A. C. & PERAZZI, P. 1995/96, Due nuovi frammenti die statue stele rinvenuti in Lunigiana. *Rivista di Scienze Preistoriche* 47: 411–22.

ANATI, E. 1981. *Le statue-stele della Lunigiana. I testimoni dell'ultima rivoluzione culturale della preistoria*. Jaca Book: Milano.

ASCHER-GREVE, J. A. 1998. The essential body: mesopotamian conceptions of the gendered body. In: M. Wyke, ed. *Gender and the body in the ancient Mediterranean*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 8–37.

AUGSTEIN, M. 2009, Der Körper als Zeichen? Deutungsmöglichkeiten von Körperinszenierungen im hallstattzeitlichen Bestattungsritual. In: K. Raimund and J. Leskovar, eds. *Interpretierte Eisenzeiten. Fallstudien, Methoden, Theorie. Tagungsbeiträge der 3. Linzer Gespräche zur Interpretativen Eisenzeitarchäologie*. Linz: Land Oberösterreich/Oberösterreichisches Landesmuseum (Studien zur Kulturgeschichte von Oberösterreich, 22), pp. 11–25.

BARFIELD, L. H. 1995, The context of statue-menhirs, *Notizie Archaeologiche Bergomensi* 3: 11–36.

BARFIELD, L. H. 1998, Gender issues in north Italian prehistory. In: R. Whitehouse, ed. *Gender and Italian Stereotypes: Challenging the Stereotypes*, London: Accordia Research Institute, pp. 143–56.

BARFIELD, L. H. 2007, Beads and other necklace elements. In: L. H. Barfield, ed. *Excavations in the Riparo Valtenesi, Manerba, 1976-1994*. Florence: Istituto Italiano di Preistoria e Protostoria., pp. 296–331.

BIRDWHISTELL, R. 1970: *Kinesics and Context. Essays on Body Motion Communication*, Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania.

BOLGER, D. 2013: Introduction: Gender Prehistory – The Story So Far. In: D. Bolger, ed. *A Companion to Gender Prehistory*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, pp. 1–19.

BREUSS, S. 2000/2001: Aus der Leiblichkeit fließt alles in Leben und Kultur der Menschen. Volkskundliche Blicke auf den weiblichen Körper. *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien*, 130/31: 193–202.

BUDIN, S. L. 2013, Review: *A Companion to Gender Prehistory*, edited by D. R. Bolger. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell 2013. *American Journal of Archaeology* 117(4), 2013, [accessed 3 December 2013]. Available at: <<http://www.ajaonline.org/online-review-book/1667>>.

BULGER, T. D. & R. A. JOYCE 2013, Archaeology of Embodied Subjectivities. . In: D. Bolger, ed. *A Companion to Gender Prehistory*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, pp. 68–85.

BUTLER, J. P. 1990: *Gender Trouble. Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, New York: Routledge.

CASINI, S. 2008. I monoliti istoriati con simbologia femminile della Valcamonica e della Valtellina. Riflessioni e nuovi spunti di ricerca. *Notizie Archeologiche Bergomensi*, 16: 5–20.

CASINI, S. & FOSSATI, A. E. 2013: Immagini di dei, guerrieri e donne. Stele, massi incisi e arte rupestre dell'età del Rame in Valcamonica e Valtellina, In R. C. De Marinis, ed. *L'Età del Rame. La pianura padana e le Alpi al tempo di Ötzi*. Brescia: Massetti Rodella Editori (exhibition catalog Brescia), pp. 161–196.

CATALOGUE 1998. *Dei di pietra: La grande statuaria antropomorfa nell'Europa del III millennio a.C. / Dieux de pierre: La grande statuaire anthropomorphe in Europe au III millènaire avant J. C.* Milano: Skira editore & Regione Autonoma Valle d'Aosta.

CHELIDONIO, G. & MOTTES, E. 1995: Dai megalitti alle statue stele. Verifiche sperimentali e osservazioni preliminari sugli aspetti tecnici di produzione dei monumenti di Arco. In A. Pedrotti, ed. *Le statue stele di Arco. La statuaria antropomorfa alpina nel III millennio a.C.: abbigliamento, fibre tessili e colore*. Trento: Museo Civico, pp. 90–106.

CORBOUD, P. 2009. Les stèles anthropomorphes de la nécropole du Petit-Chasseur à Sion (Valais, Suisse). *Bulletin d'Etudes Préhistoriques et Archeologiques Alpines*, XX: 9–97.

DAL RÍ, L. & TECCHIATI, U. 1995. Zur Vor-und Frühgeschichte des mittleren und unteren Vinschgaues. In: L. Dal Rí, U. Tecchiati, U. and P. Bassetti, *Archäologie und Kunstgeschichte von Kastelbell-Tschars und Umgebung. Tschar: Raiffeisenkasse Tschar*, pp. 1–143.

D'AMICO, C. 1995: Le statue stele di Arco. Il materiale e la sua provenienza. In A. Pedrotti, ed. *Le statue stele di Arco. La statuaria antropomorfa alpina nel III millennio a.C.: abbigliamento, fibre tessili e colore*. Trento: Museo Civico, pp. 82–89.

D'ANNA, A. 2002a: Les statues-menhirs en Europe à la fin du Néolithique et au début de l'Âge de Bronze. In: A. Philippon, ed. *Statues-menhirs : des énigmes de pierre venues du fond des âges*, Rodez: Éditions du Rouergue,, pp. 150–77.

D'ANNA, A. 2002b, "Statues-menhirs? Stèles? Dalles anthropomorphes? Ou simplement sculptures préhistorique?," In: A. Philippon, ed. *Statues-menhirs : des énigmes de pierre venues du fond des âges*, Rodez: Éditions du Rouergue, pp. 52–53.

DE MARINIS, R. C. 1994a, Il fenomeno delle statue-stele e stele antropomorfe dell'età del Rame in Europa. In: S. Casini, ed. *Le pietre degli dei: menhir e stele dell'età del rame in Valcamonica e Valtellina*, Gorle: Centro Culturale Nicolò Rezzara, pp. 31–58.

DE MARINIS, R. C. 1994b, "La datazione dello stile III A. In: S. Casini, ed. *Le pietre degli dei: menhir e stele dell'età del rame in Valcamonica e Valtellina*, Gorle: Centro Culturale Nicolò Rezzara, pp. 69–88.

ELLIS, H. 1894, *Man and Woman: A Study of Secondary and Tertiary Sexual Characters*, London: The Walter Scott Pub. Co.

EICHER, J. B. & ROACH-HIGGINS, M. 1993, "Definition and Classification of Dress. In: R. Barnes and J. B. Eicher, eds. *Dress and Gender. Making and Meaning in Cultural Contexts*, vol. 2., Oxford: Berg Providence, pp. 8–28.

FAUSTO-STERLIN, A. 2000. *Sexing the Body: Gender politics and the construction of sexuality*, New York: Basic Books.

FAVRE, S. & MOTTET, M. 2004. La nécropole du Petit-Chasseur à Sion (Suisse) : rapports entre dolmens et stèles anthropomorphes, parallèles avec le site de Saint-Martin de Corléans à Aoste (Italie). *Notizie Archeologiche Bergomensi*, 12: 31–37.

FEDELE, F. G. 2013, Origini dell'ideologia cerimoniale centroalpina dell'età del Rame. Una "fase zero" di IV millennio? *Notizie Archeologiche Bergomensi*, 19, 77–100

FEDELE, F. G. 2013, La società dell'età del Rame nell'area alpina e prealpina. In: R. C. de Marinis, ed. *L'età del Rame. La Pianura Padana e le Alpi al tempo di Ötzi*, Roccafranca (Brescia): La compagnia della stampa Massetti Rodella, pp. 45–67.

FERRANDO CABONA, I. & CRUSI, E. 1980. *Storia dell'insediamento in Lunigiana: Alta Valle Aulella*, Genova: Sageb.

FISHER, G. & LOREN, D. D. 2003. Embodying Identity in Archaeology. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*, 13(2): 225–30.

FOSSATI, A.E., PEDROTTI, A. & NOTHDURFTER, H. 2004. La statue-stele di Laces nel contesto delle statue-stele "atesine". *Notizie Archeologiche Bergomensi*, 12: 253–64.

FOUCAULT, M. 1975. *Surveiller et punir. La naissance de la prison*, Paris: Gallimard.

FOUCAULT, M. 1976. *Histoire de la sexualité 1. La volonté de savoir*, Paris: Gallimard.

GALLAY, A. 1995. Les stèles anthropomorphes du site mégalithique du Petit-Chasseur à Sion (Valais, Suisse). *Notizie Archeologiche Bergomensi*, 3: 167–94.

GELL, A. 1998, *Art and Agency. An Anthropological Theory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

GILCHRIST, R. 2000, Archaeological biographies: realizing human lifecycles, -courses and -histories. *World Archaeology* 31: 325–28.

GOSDEN, C. 2005, What Do Objects Want? *Journal of Arch. Method and Theory*, 12 (3): 193–211.

HAEBERLE, E.J. 1978. *The Sex Atlas. A new illustrated guide*, New York: The Seabury Press.

HAEBERLE, E.J. 1983, *Die Sexualität des Menschen. Handbuch und Atals*, Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.

HANSEN, S. 2002. "Überausstattungen" in Gräbern und Horten der Frühbronzezeit. In: J. Müller, ed. *Vom Endneolithikum zur Frühbronzezeit: Muster sozialen Wandels? (Tagung Bamberg 14. – 16. Juni 2001)*. Bonn: Habelt (Universitätsforschungen zur prähistorischen Archäologie, 90), pp. 151–73.

HEYD, V. & HARRISON, R. 2004. Sion, Aosta e le trasformazioni nell'Europa del terzo millennio a.C. *Notizie Archeologiche Bergomensi*, 12: 143–73.

HARRISON, R. & HEYD, V. 2007. The Transformation of Europe in the Third Millennium BC: the example of 'Le Petit-Chasseur I + III' (Sion, Valais, Switzerland). *Prähistorische Zeitschrift*, 82, 129–214

HODDER, I. 1997. Commentary: The Gender Screen. In: J. Moore and E. Scott, eds. *Invisible People and Processes. Writing Gender and Childhood into European Archaeology*, London, New York: Leicester University Press, pp. 75–78.

HOFMANN, K. P. 2009: Grabbefunde zwischen sex und gender. In: U. Rambuscheck, ed. *Zwischen Diskursanalyse und Isotopenforschung. Methoden der archäologischen Geschlechterforschung. Bericht der 3. Sitzung der AG Geschlechterforschung auf der 78. Tagung des Nordwestdeutschen Verbandes für Altertumsforschung e.V. in Schleswig 2007*, Münster, New York, München, Berlin: Waxmann (Frauen – Forschung – Archäologie, 8), pp. 133–61.

IARDELLA, R., PARIBENI, E. & TOSATTI, A.M. 2004. Nuovi rinvenimenti in Lunigiana: le statue-stele di Groppoli e Sorano. *Notizie Archeologiche Bergomensi*, 12: 127–42.

IARDELLA, R., LANDI, S., PARIBENI, E. & TISCORNIA, I. 2005. Groppoli, un sito con statue stele nella media valle della Magra. *Notiziario della Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici della Toscana*, 1: 20–24.

JÄGER, U. 2004. *Der Körper, der Leib und die Soziologie. Entwurf einer Theorie der Inkorporierung*. Königstein: Helmer.

JOYCE, R.A. 2005. Archaeology of the Body. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 34: 139–58.

KAUFMANN, G. 2012. Figuren der Vergangenheit. Die kupferzeitlichen Menhirstatuen aus dem Südalpenraum. *Südtirol in Wort und Bild* 1: 16–23.

KNAPPETT, C. & MALAFOURIS, L. 2008. Material Agency. *Towards a Non-Anthropocentric Approach*. New York: Springer Science & Business Media LLC.

KUPER, H. 1973. Costume and Identity. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 15(3): 348–67.

LADURNER-PARTHANES, M. 1952. Die Algunder Menhire. Fundberichte und Fundgebiet. *Der Schlern*, 26 (7/8): 310–44.

LARSEN, S.L. 2003. Equality for the sexes in human evolution? Early hominid sexual dimorphism and implications for mating systems and social behavior. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 100(5): 9103–04.

LORBER, J. 2000. Night to His Day: The Social Construction of Gender. In: P. S. Rothenberg, ed. *Race, Class, and Gender in the United States. An integrated study*. New York: Worth Publishers [fifth edition], pp. 54–65.

LUNZ, R. 1973. *Ur- und Frühgeschichte Südtirols: Rätsel und Deutung*. Bozen: Athesia.

LUNZ, R. 1981. *Archäologie Südtirols 1: Von den Jägern des Mesolithikums (um 7000 v. Chr.) bis zum Ende des Weströmischen Reiches (476 n. Chr.)*. Calliano, Trento: Manfrini (Archäologisch-historische Forschung in Tirol, 7).

MAGGIANI, A. 1976. Contributo alla statuaria megalitica dell'area lunigianese. *Prospettiva*, 5: 47–50.

MANNONI, T. 1994. Materiali e tecniche di lavorazione. In: M. Ratti, ed. *Antenati di pietra. Statue stele della Lunigiana e archeologia del territorio*. Genova: Sagep (exhibition catalog Spezia), pp. 61–68.

MAUSS, M. 1936. Les techniques du corps. *Journal de Psychologie*, 32(3/4): 271–93.

MESKELL, L. 1998. The Irresistible Body and the Seduction of Archaeology. In: D. Monsterrat, ed. *Changing Bodies, Changing Meanings. Studies of the body in Antiquity*. Loondon: Routledge, pp. 139–61.

MEZZENA, F. 1998a, Le stele antropomorfe nell'area megalitica di Aosta. In: F. Ambrosio, ed. *Dei di pietra: La grande statuaria antropomorfa nell'Europa del III millennio a.C. / Dieux de pierre: La grande statuaire anthropomorphe in Europe au III millènaire avant J. C.*, Milano: Skira editore & Regione Autonoma Valle d'Aosta, pp. 90–121.

MEZZENA, F. 1998b. Le stele antropomorfe in Europa. In: F. Ambrosio, ed. *Dei di pietra: La grande statuaria antropomorfa nell'Europa del III millennio a.C. / Dieux de pierre: La grande statuaire anthropomorphe in Europe au III millènaire avant J. C.*, Milano: Skira editore & Regione Autonoma Valle d'Aosta, pp. 14–89.

MOITRA, S. 2002. *Feminist thought. Androcentrism, communication, and objectivity*, New Dehli: Munshiram Manoharlal.

MOORE, H.L. 1994. *A Passion for Difference. Essays in Anthropology and Gender*, Cambridge: Indiana University Press.

MÜLLER-SCHEESSEL, N. 2008. Auffälligkeiten bei Armhaltungen hallstattzeitlicher Körperbestattungen: Postdeponale Eingriffe, funktionale Notwendigkeiten oder kulturelle Zeichen? In: C. Kümmel, B. Schweizer and U. Veit, eds. *Körperinszenierung – Objektsammlung – Monumentalisierung. Totenritual und Grabkult in frühen Gesellschaften. Archäologische Quellen in kulturwissenschaftlicher Perspektive*. Münster: Waxmann (Tübinger Archäologische Taschenbücher, 6), pp. 517–35.

MUSEO DELLE STATUE STELE LUNIGIANESI PONTREMOLI. *Classificazione*. Museo delle Statue Stele Lunigianesi – Castello del Piagnaro Pontremoli. [accessed 1 April 2013]. Available at: < <http://www.statuestele.org/ita/122/1/classificazione.htm> >

NORDBLADH, J. & YATES, T. 1990: This Perfect Body, this Virgin Teest. In: I Bapty and T. Yates, eds. *Archaeology after Structuralism. Post-structuralism and the practice of archaeology*. London: Routledge, pp. 222–37.

PARIBENI, E. 2004. Necropoli della Quartareccia (Filattiera, Massa Carrara). In: R.C. De Marinis and G. Spadea, eds. *I Liguri. Un antico popolo europeo tra Alpi e Mediterraneo*. Milano: Skira (exhibition catalog Genova), pp. 399–443.

PARIBENI, E., IARDELLA, R., TISCORNIA, I. & TOSATTI, A.M. 2012. Lo scavo delle statue-stele di Groppoli ed altre ricerche nel territorio di Mulazzo (MS). *Preistoria Alpina*, 46(2): 235–44.

PEDROTTI, A. 1993. *Uomini di pietra. I ritrovamenti di Arco e il fenomeno delle statue stele nell'arco alpino*. Trento: Provincia autonoma di Trento, Servizio Beni Culturali (exhibition catalog Castel Beseno).

PEDROTTI, A. 1995a. Le statue-stele e le stele antropomorfe del Trentino Alto-Adige e del Veneto occidentale. Gruppo atesino, gruppo Brentonico, gruppo della Lessinia. *Notizie Archeologiche Bergomensi*, 3: 259–80.

PEDROTTI, A. 1995b. La statuaria antropomorfa dell'età del Rame nell'arco alpino. In: A. Pedrotti, ed. *Le Statue Stele di Arco: La statuaria antropomorfa alpina nel III millennio a.C.:abbigliamento, fibre tessili e colore*, Trento: Museo Civico di Riva del Garda, Ufficio Beni Archologici della Provincia Autonoma di Trento, pp. 11–39.

PEDROTTI, A. 1995c. Le statue stele di Arco nel contesto dell'età del Rame nella Piana Benacense. In: A. Pedrotti, ed. *Le Statue Stele di Arco: La statuaria antropomorfa alpina nel III millennio a.C.:abbigliamento, fibre tessili e colore*, Trento: Museo Civico di Riva del Garda, Ufficio Beni Archologici della Provincia Autonoma di Trento, pp. 41–69.

PEDROTTI, A. 1998. Gli elementi d'abbigliamento e d'ornamento nelle statue stele dell'arco alpino. *Archéologie en Languedoc*, 22: 299–315.

PEDROTTI, A. & TECCHIATI, U. 2013. Iconografia e simbologia delle statue-stele dell'area atesina e lessinica. In: R. C. De Marinis, ed. *L'Età del Rame. La pianura padana e le Alpi al tempo di Ötzi*. Brescia: Massetti Rodella Editori (exhibition catalog Brescia), pp. 221–31.

PICCIOLI, R. 1982. Il frammento di statua stele n.53 "Arcola" del Museo Civico della Spezia. *Giornale Storico della Lunigiana e del Territorio Lucense*, XXXIII: 91–95.

PICKERING, A. 1995. *The Mangle of Practice. Time, Agency and Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

RAUTMAN, A. E. & TALALY, L. E. 2000. Introduction: Diverse Approaches to the Study of Gender in Archaeology. In: A. E. Rautman, ed. *Reading the Body. Representations and Remains in the Archaeological Record*, Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 1–12.

ROBB, J. 1994. Gender Contraditions, Moral Coalitions, and Inequality in Prehistoric Italy. *Journal of European Archaeology*, 2(1): 20–49.

ROBB, J. 1997. Female beauty and male violence in early Italian society. In: A. Koloski-Ostrow and C. Lyons, eds. *Naked truths: Women, sexuality, and gender in Classical art and archaeology*, London: Routledge, pp. 42–66.

ROBB, J. 2009. People of Stone. Stelae, Personhood, and Society in Prehistoric Europe. In: *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, 16(3): 162–83.

SAX, L. 2002. How common is Intersex? A Response to Anne Fausto-Sterling. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 39(3): 174–78.

SCOTT, E. 1997. Introduction: On the incompleteness of archaeological narratives. In: J. Moore and E. Scott, eds. *Invisible people and processes. Writing gender and childhood into European archaeology*. London, New York: Leicester University Press, pp. 1–12.

SOFAER DEREVENSKI, J. 2007: Engendering children, engendering archaeology. In: J. Moore and E. Scott, eds. *Invisible people and processes. Writing gender and childhood into European archaeology*. London, New York: Leicester University Press, pp. 192–202.

SØRENSEN, M.L.S. 2000. *Gender Archaeology*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

STINSON, S. 2012. Growth variation: biological and cultural factors. In: S. Stinson, B. Bogin and D. O'Rourke, eds. *Human biology. An evolutionary and biocultural perspective*. Hoboken, N.J: Wiley Blackwell [2nd ed], pp. 587–636.

TECCHIATI, U. 2004. Luoghi di culto e assetti territoriali nell'età del Rame della regione atesina. *Notizie Archeologiche Bergomensi*, 12: 15–30.

TRAUTNER, H.M. 1991. *Lehrbuch der Entwicklungspsychologie 2. Theorien und Befunde*. Göttingen, Toronto, Zürich: Hogrefe.

WHITEHOUSE, R.D. 1992. Tools the Manmaker: the cultural construction of gender in Italian prehistory. *Accordia Research Papers*, 3: 41–53.

WHITEHOUSE, R.D. 2007. Gender archaeology in Europe. In: S. Milledge Nelson, ed., *Worlds of gender : the archaeology of women's lives around the globe*. Lanham, MD, Plymouth UK: AltaMira Press, pp. 139–89.

WHITEHOUSE, R.D. 2013. Gender in Central Mediterranean Prehistory. In: D. Bolger, ed. *A Companion to Gender Prehistory*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, pp. 480–501.

ZIDDA, G. 1997. Aspetti iconografici delle stele antropomorfe di Aosta. In: *La valle d'Aosta nel quadro della preistoria e protostoria dell'arco alpino centro-occidentale*, *Atti della XXXI Riunione Scientifica*, Istituto italiano di preistoria e protostoria, Courmayeur 2–5 juin 1994, pp. 225–43.

Bibliographical Note

Susanna Harris is ERC Postdoctoral Research Associate for the PROCON project at the Institute of Archaeology, University College London. She specializes in the textiles, clothing and leather of prehistoric Europe and is interested in developing methods and approaches to enhance the role of these perishable materials in understanding past societies.

Address: Institute of Archaeology, University College London, 31-34 Gordon Square, London, WC1H 0PY, UK [email tcnsm4@ucl.ac.uk, susannaharris@hotmail.com]

Kerstin P. Hofmann is Junior Research Group Leader of the key topic group “Identities: Space and Knowledge Related Identification” within the framework of the Excellence Cluster 264 „TOPOI – The Formation and Transformation of Space and Knowledge in Ancient Civilizations“ at the Freie Universität, Berlin. After her PhD on Thanatoarchaeology and Bronze Age cremation burials in the Elbe-Weser-Triangle, Germany (2006), she held a foreign exchange scholarship from the German Archaeological Institute (DAI), Department

Rome. Her interests lie in the fields of burial archaeology, material culture studies, archaeology of identity, cultural change and concepts of space and time.

Address: Freie Universität Berlin, Topoi Building Dahlem, Hittorfstraße 18, 14195 Berlin, Germany [email: kerstin.hofmann@topoi.org]

Appendix 1. Lunigiana A statue-menhirs considered in this study. Measurements of fragments are in brackets, uncertain attributions are marked “?”, “absent” refers to information that is missing due to incomplete preservation, “–” indicates that the feature is not present. Motifs added in later periods are not included in the table.

Statue name (Corpus - number)	Height cm	Width cm	Shape	Head/Face	Upper Body	Waist	Lower Body	Back	Side	References
Campoli (4)	120	51	slab, trapezoid, with stepped, semicircular top	U-shaped face? <i>relief added to in later period</i>	collarbones + arms <i>relief added to in later period</i>	–	–	–	–	Ambrosi, 1972: 41–44
Casola (38)	130	51	slab, rectangular, with stepped, semicircular top	U-shaped face	collarbones + arms	dagger	–	–	–	Ferrando Cabona & Crusi, 1980: 119–22 fig. 187; Ambrosi, 1988: 22,24 fig.6
Moncigoli I (17)	85	48	slab, rectangular, with stepped, semicircular top	U-shaped face, eyes	collarbones + arms, fingers, high relief breasts	–	–	–	–	Ambrosi, 1972: 74–76
Moncigoli II (18)	(57)	43	slab, rectangular, with stepped, semicircular top	U-shaped face	collarbones + arms, low relief breasts <i>relief worn</i>	–	–	–	–	Ambrosi, 1972: 78
Pontevecchio I (5)	42	21	slab, rectangular with stepped, rounded top	U-shaped face + 2 lateral discs	collarbones + arms, hands, <i>relief worn</i>	–	–	–	–	Ambrosi, 1972: 44–47
Pontevec	(54),	23	slab, rectangular	?	collarbones +					Ambrosi, 1972: 48–

chio II (6)	ca. 60		with stepped top		arms					49
Pontevecchio III (7)	62	29	slab, trapezoid, with slightly stepped top	U-shaped face	collarbones + arms, low relief breasts	–	–	–	–	Ambrosi, 1972: 50–51
Pontevecchio IV (8)	96	65	slab, rectangular with stepped, semicircular top	inverted U-shaped face + 2 lateral discs	collarbones + arms,	–	–	–	–	Ambrosi, 1972: 52–53
Pontevecchio V (9)	74	30	slab, inverted trapezoid, with stepped, semicircular top	inverted U-shaped face + 2 lateral discs	collarbones + arms, fingers ?	–	–	–	–	Ambrosi, 1972: 54–55
Pontevecchio VI (10)	110	37	slab, rectangular with stepped, semicircular top	inverted U-shaped face	collarbones + arms, fingers	dagger	–	–	–	Ambrosi, 1972: 56–57
Pontevecchio VII (11)	100	42	slab, rectangular, slightly convex with stepped, semicircular top	U-shaped face	collarbones + arms, hands, low relief breasts Necklace?	–	–	–	–	Ambrosi, 1972: 58–59
Pontevecchio VIII (12)	117	39	slab, rectangular, slightly concave with stepped, semicircular top	U-shaped face + 2 lateral discs	collarbones + arms, hands, fingers	dagger	–	–	–	Ambrosi, 1972: 60–61
Pontevecchio IX (13)	(53)	48	slab, rectangular, slightly convex with stepped, semicircular top	inverted U-shaped face	collarbones + arms, low relief breasts <i>relief worn</i>	–	–	–	–	Ambrosi, 1972: 62–63
Sorano VII (73)	65	33	slab, rectangular with stepped, semicircular top	U-shaped face <i>relief worn</i>	collarbones + arms, hands, fingers	dagger	–	–	–	Paribeni, 2004: 442–43

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Appendix 2. Lunigiana B statue-menhirs considered in this study. Measurements of fragments are in brackets, uncertain attributions are marked “?”, “absent” refers to information that is missing due to incomplete preservation, “–” indicates that the feature is not present. Filetto VI, VII, La Spezia I, II and Venelia IV are excluded as they are lost, Betollito, Caprio, Calice and Talavorno I are excluded as they remain unpublished (Paribeni, et al. 2012, 243–44). Motifs added in later periods are not included in the table.

Statue name (Corpus - number)	Height cm	width cm	Shape	Head/Face	Upper Body	waist	Lower Body	Back	Side	References
Arcola (53)	(80)	(20)	slab fragment with defined neck and semicircular head	U-shaped face	collarbones, arm?	absent	absent	–	–	Piccioli, 1982; Paribeni et al., 2012: 243
Aulla (63)	(32)	(36)	semicircular head with defined neck and	relief worn	absent	absent	absent	absent	absent	Ambrosi & Perazzi, 1995; 415–18
Codiponte (55)	(83)	(23)	slab fragment	absent	collarbones, arm, hand and finger	dagger	–	?	absent	Ferrando Cabona & Crusi, 1980: 96, 100 fig. 136–37
Canossa (44)	(110)	50	slab, rectangular	absent	collarbones, arms, fingers	dagger with sheath	–	–	–	Maggiana, 1976
Castagneta (45)	(22)	(28)	semicircular head with chin and the defined neck, trunk is absent	U-shaped face with eyes	absent	–	–	–	–	Ambrosi, 1972: 167–68
Falcinello (50)	–	–	slab, with a defined neck	absent	high relief? Breast	–	–	–	–	Ambrosi, 1975/76; Paribeni et al., 2012: 243

Filetto III (21)	(113)	50	slab, rectangular, slightly convex with a defined neck, head absent	absent	collarbones + arms, fingers; high relief breasts; necklace -perhaps incised later?	–	–	–	–	Ambrosi, 1972: 83–84
Filetto IV (24)	(139)	70	slab, rectangular, slightly convex, neck and head absent	absent	Arms, fingers	dagger + tassel	–	–	–	Ambrosi, 1972: 91–93
Filetto V (25)	(38)	-	slab, with a defined neck and semicircular head	U-shaped face + 2 lateral discs	collarbones + arm, rest absent	absent	absent	–	–	Ambrosi, 1972: 93–94
Filetto VIII (32)	(40)	(53)	a defined neck and semicircular head	U-shaped face + 2 lateral circles	absent	absent	absent	absent	absent	Ambrosi, 1972: 106–07
Filetto X (47)	(35)	35	slab, rectangular with defined neck	absent	collarbones, arms high relief breast, necklace	absent	absent	–	–	Ambrosi & Cavalli, 1975; Museo delle statue stele Lunigianesi Pontremoli, 2013
Filetto XI (57)	(33)	(35)	slab, defined neck with semicircular head, slightly pointed chin	U-shaped face, eyes, double lateral discs	absent	absent	absent	absent	absent	Ambrosi & Cavalli, 1982/83: 143–44
Gigliana (46)	-	-	slab, fragment	absent	gingers, axe?	dagger + sheath	absent	absent	absent	Ambrosi, 1975: 136–37; Maggiana, 1976: 47
Groppoli I (69)	106	37	slab, rectangular, with a defined neck and semicircular head	U-shaped face	collarbones + arms, fingers; low relief breasts	–	–	–	–	Iardella et al., 2004: fig 3.A; Paribeni, et al. 2012: 236–37

Groppoli II (70)	(108)	59	slab, slightly trapezoid, with an defined neck	absent	double collarbones + arms, fingers; high relief breasts	–	–	–	–	Iardella et al., 2004: 130, fig.3.B; Paribeni et al., 2012: 236–37
Groppoli III (71)	120	53	slab, trapezoid, with a defined neck and semicircular head	U-shaped face	collarbones + arms, fingers, axe	dagger	–	–	–	Iardella, et al. 2004: fig 3.C ; Paribeni, et al. 2012: 236–37
Groppoli IV (72)	(15)	(17)	fragment of a head	absent	absent	absent	absent	absent	absent	Iardella et al., 2004: 131; Paribeni, et al., 2012: 243
Groppoli V (75)	ca. 125	Ca. 45	slab, rectangular slightly convex with an defined neck and semicircular head with chin	U-shaped face + 2 lateral discs	collarbones + arms, fingers; low relief breasts;	–	–	–	–	Iardella et al., 2005; Paribeni et al., 2012: 236–37, 243, fig. 3–5
Groppoli VI (76)	Ca. 98	Ca. 50	slab, trapezoid, with an defined neck and semicircular head	U-shaped face	double collarbones + arms, fingers; high relief breasts;	–	–	–	–	Paribeni et al., 2012: 243
Groppoli VII (77)	(Ca. 120)	Ca. 50	slab, rectangular with a defined neck	absent	collarbones + arms, fingers; high relief breasts;	–	–	–	–	Paribeni et al., 2012: 243
Groppoli VIII (78)	(ca. 125)	Ca. 70	slab, trapezoid with a defined neck	absent	collarbones + arms, fingers;	dagger	–	–	–	Paribeni et al., 2012: 243, fig. 3–4
Malgrate I (16)	(66)	43	slab, rectangular with a defined neck and semicircular	U-shaped face ?	collarbones + arms, fingers ?; high relief breasts	absent	absent	–	–	Ambrosi, 1972: 72–73

			head							
Malgrate II (20)	(72)	(66)	slab, rectangular (?) with an defined neck and semicircular head with chin	U-shaped face	collarbones + arms, axe	absent	absent	–	–	Ambrosi, 1972: 31
Malgrate III (34)	(94)	(30)	slab, rectangular (?)	absent	collarbones + arms, fingers; high relief breasts	–	–	–	–	Ambrosi, 1972: 110
Malgrate IV (35)	(35)	(15)	defined neck with a semi-circular shaped profile necklace and semicircular head	relief worn	absent	absent	absent	absent	absent	Ambrosi, 1972: 111–12
Malgrate V (36)	(66)	(42)	slab	absent	arm	dagger	absent	absent	absent	Ambrosi, 1972: 113–14
Malgrate VI (58)	(57)	(37)	slab fragment with defined neck and semicircular head	U-shaped face relief worn	collarbone, high relief breast, relief worn	absent	absent	absent	absent	Ambrosi & Cavalli, 1982/83: 144–45
Minuccia no I (37)	(108)	55	slab, rectangular, slightly convex	absent	collarbones + arms, fingers, axe	dagger	–	–	–	Ambrosi, 1972: 115–17
Minuccia no II (40)	110	53	slab, rectangular (?) with an defined neck and semicircular head with chin	U-shaped face	collarbones + arms	dagger				Ambrosi, 1972: 125–26
Minuccia no III (42)	146	58	slab, trapezoid with a defined neck and semicircular head	U-shaped face	split double collarbones + arms, axe	dagger	–	–	–	Ambrosi, 1972: 129–31
Mocrone (52)	(30)	(31)	slab, defined neck and semicircular head	U-shaped face relief worn	absent	absent	absent	absent	absent	Ambrosi & Cavalli, 1978/79; Museo delle statue stele

										Lunigianesi Pontremoli, 2013
San Cristoforo di Gordana (31)	(54)	30	slab, rectangular (?)	absent	arms, fingers	–	–	–	–	Ambrosi, 1972: 103–05
Sarzana (19)	(35)	(46)	defined neck and semicircular head	U-shaped face+ 2 lateral circles	absent	absent	absent	absent	absent	Ambrosi, 1972: 79– 80
Scorcetoli (29)	(95)	59	slab, rectangular (?) with defined neck and semicircular (?) head	U-shaped face (?)	collarbones + arms, axe <i>relief worn</i>	absent	absent	–	–	Ambrosi, 1972: 98– 100; Anati, 1981: tab. 41a–b
Sorano I (22)	(140)	62	slab, rectangular with defined neck	absent	collarbones + arms, hands, fingers, necklace ? high relief breasts	–	–	–	–	Ambrosi, 1972: 86
Sorano II (23)	(33)	(36)	defined neck and semicircular head	U-shaped face+ 2 lateral discs	necklace, absent.	absent	absent	absent	absent	Ambrosi, 1972: 88– 90
Sorano III (41)	(140)	(36)	slab	absent	collarbone + arm	dagger	–	–	–	Ambrosi, 1972: 127–28
Sorano IV (66)	-	-	small fragment of the slab	absent	collarbone, arm	absent	absent	absent	absent	Ambrosi, 1984: 17, fig 6
Taponecco (49)	122	42	slab, slightly convex, defined neck with semicircular head	U-shaped face	collarbones, arms, hands, fingers	dagger	–	–	–	Ambrosi, 1975: 66– 67; Ambrosi, 1984
Treschiet	(135)	39	slab, rectangular	absent	collarbones +	–	–	–	–	Ambrosi, 1972:

to (43))		with defined neck		arms, hands, fingers, necklace; high relief breasts					132–35
Venelia II (59)	(96)	37	slab, rectangular, with a defined neck	absent	collarbones + arms, fingers	dagger	–	–	–	Ambrosi, 1984; Paribeni, et al. 2012: 243; Museo delle statue stele Lunigianesi Pontremoli 2013
Venelia III (62)	(31)	(42)	slab, defined neck with necklace and semicircular head	U-shaped face, 2 lateral discs	absent	absent	absent	absent	absent	Ambrosi & Perazzi, 1995: 411–14; Paribeni, et al. 2012: 243; Museo delle statue stele Lunigianesi Pontremoli, 2013
Verrucola (28)	(31)	(54)	defined neck and semicircular head with chin	U-shaped face + eyes	absent	absent	absent	absent	absent	Ambrosi, 1972: 95–96
Zignago (1)	108	37	slab, rectangular with defined neck and semicircular head	U-shaped face + eyes	secondary use	secondary use	secondary use	–	–	Ambrosi, 1972: 33–37; Anati, 1981: tab. 41a–b

Appendix 3. Atesino group statue-menhirs considered in this study. Measurements of fragments are in brackets, uncertain attributions are marked “?”, “absent” refers to information that is missing due to incomplete preservation, “–” indicates that the feature is not present. Tocelinga/Tötschling, Velturmo/Feldthurns and Laion/Lajen are excluded because they depict daggers of a later typological phase; further Corzes/Kortsch (Dal Rí & Tecchiati, 1995: 34) and Laces/Latsch (Fossati et al., 2004) are excluded.

Statue name	Height cm	Width cm	Shape	Head/Face	Upper Body	Waist	Lower Body	Back	Side	References
Arco I	215	94	slab, rectangular, slightly trapezoid with a low, rounded triangular top	T-shaped face	beaded necklace + 1 dagger, 6 daggers, 3 axes, 3 Halberds, 1 Hammer/Pin	festoon belt	–	–	festoon belt	Pedrotti, 1993: 18–19; 1995a: 272–73
Arco II	170	58	slab, inverted trapezoid with a low, rounded triangular top	–	3 daggers, 1 Hammer/Pin	festoon belt	–	checked cloak, Festoon belt	cloak fringe, Festoon belt	Pedrotti, 1993: 20; 1995a: 272–73
Arco III	83	34	slab, trapezoid, slightly convex with a rounded top	<i>Relief worn</i>	relief breast, curvilinear garment <i>Relief worn</i>	–	–	checked cloak	curvilinear ear garment	Pedrotti, 1993: 22–23; 1995a: 272–73.
Arco IV	86	30	slab, trapezoid, slightly convex with a rounded top	T-shaped face, headdress	high relief breasts, curvilinear garment with a row of embellishment	–	–	headdress, checked cloak	headdress, concentric circle pendants, checked cloak	Pedrotti 1993, 24; 1995a: 272–73
Arco V	130	40	slab, rectangular, convex with a rounded top	absent	relief worn	relief worn	relief worn	checked cloak	curvilinear ear garment	Pedrotti, 1993: 25–26; 1995a: 272–73
Arco VI	55	23	slab, rectangular, convex with a rounded top	T-shaped face	beaded necklace	belt	–	–	belt	Pedrotti, 1993: 28–29; 1995a: 272–73
Arco VII	75	32	slab, trapezoid,	T-shaped	headdress, high	–	–	headdress	headdress	On display in the

			convex with a rounded top	face, headdress	relief breasts, curvilinear garment			ss, checked cloak	ss, concentric circle pendants, curvilinear ear garment, checked cloak	Museo Civico di Riva del Garda
Arco VIII	132	40	slab, rectangular with a rounded top	–	2 dagger	festoon belt	–	festoon belt, cloak fringe	cloak relief worn	On display in the Museo Civico di Riva del Garda
Fiè allo Sciliar / Völs am Schlern	-	-	slab ?, fragment	absent	absent	festoon belt	absent	absent	absent	Pedrotti, 1998: 302; Tecchiati, 2004: 19 fig. 3
Lagundo / Algund A	(54)	(35)	slab, convex	absent	relief breast, curvilinear garment	–	absent	headdress, striped cloak	headdress, concentric circle pendants, curvilinear ear garment	Lunz, 1973: 48; Pedrotti, 1993: 10; 1995a: 267–68
Lagundo / Algund B	275	100	slab, rectangular	absent	linear Necklace + dagger, 7 dagger, 14 axes,	festoon belt	2 daggers	festoon belt, Banded striped	festoon belt, Cloak fringe	Lunz, 1973: 48; Pedrotti, 1995a: 267–68; Tecchiati, 2004:

								cloak		30
Lagundo /Algund C	95	38	slab, inverted trapezoid	–	1 dagger	festoon belt		festoon belt	festoon belt	Ladurner-Parthanes, 1952; Lunz, 1973: 48; Pedrotti, 1995a: 267–68
Lagundo / Algund D	115	50	slab, rectangular with a rounded top	–	1 dagger	festoon belt		striped cloak, festoon belt	cloak fringe festoon belt	Lunz, 1981: 87–91, taf. 25.5
Revò	59	32	slab, rectangular	T-shaped face	–	–	–	striped cloak	cloak fringe	Pedrotti, 1993: 30; 1995a: 274
Santa Verena / St. Verena	(152)	68	slab, slightly inverted trapezoid	absent	linear necklace + dagger, 10 axes, 2 daggers <i>Relief not complete</i>	festoon belt	?	–	festoon belt	Lunz, 1973: 83, taf. 2.5; Lunz, 1981: 87–91; Pedrotti, 1993: 4
Termeno / Tramin	181	62	slab, slightly inverted trapezoid with a low, rounded triangular top	–	beaded necklace, 3 daggers, 2 axes	festoon belt	–	beaded necklace, festoon belt; checked cloak; cloak fringe	beaded necklace, festoon belt	Lunz, 1981: 87–91, taf. 25.5; Pedrotti, 1998: 302–03

Appendix 4. Archaic Sion and Aosta group statue-menhirs considered in this study. Measurements of fragments are in brackets, uncertain attributions are marked “?”, “absent” refers to information that is missing due to incomplete preservation, “–” indicates that the feature is not present.

Statue name	Height cm	Width cm	Shape	Head/Face	Upper Body	Waist	Lower Body	Back	Side	References
Aosta 5	(220)	100	slab, inverted trapezoid	absent	–	–	–	–	–	Catalogue, 1998: 165; Mezzena, 2012 pers. comm.
Aosta 11	295	100	slab, inverted trapezoid with a small head protrusion	–	–	–	–	–	–	Catalogue, 1998: 168–69; Mezzena, 2012 pers. comm.
Aosta 12	?	?	slab, inverted trapezoid, slightly convex	absent	–	–	–	–	–	Mezzena, 2012 pers. comm.
Aosta 13	(238)	90	slab, rectangular, slightly convex	absent	diagonal strap	–	simple line with suspended fringe;	simple line with suspended fringe; diagonal strap	simple line with suspended fringe; diagonal strap	Catalogue, 1998, 167; Zidda 1997: 231; Mezzena, 2012 pers. comm
Aosta 17	2 m ?	?	slab	absent	diagonal strap			diagonal strap ?	diagonal strap ?	Mezzena, 2012 pers. comm.
Aosta 21	2 m ?	?	slab	?	linear Necklace with dots		simple line	simple line	simple line	Mezzena, 2012 pers.c omm.

							with suspended fringe	with suspended fringe	with suspended fringes	
Aosta double spiral pendant	(165)	75	slab, inverted trapezoid	absent	arms, hands, fingers, double spiral pendant	belt with vertical lines, dagger	–	–	–	Catalogue, 1998: 162; Mezzena, 1998b: 44
Sion 2	(259)	(118)	slab, inverted trapezoid	absent	arms, hands, fingers, double spiral pendant	belt, dagger	–	–	absent	Corboud, 2009: 21
Sion 4	(253)	(146)	slab	absent	linear necklace relief worn	belt ?	–	–	absent	Corboud, 2009: 33, fig. 36–37
Sion 7	(189)	(124)	slab	absent	oval shape	dagger	–	–	–	Corboud, 2009: 29–30, fig. 32–33
Sion 14	(186)	154	slab, inverted trapezoid	absent	arms, pendant, axe, linear necklace, relief worn	belt with zigzag pattern	–	–	–	Corboud, 2009: 31
Sion 16	(87)	(71)	slab	absent	Arm with dots on wrist, fingers,	2 belts with zigzag pattern , 2 daggers	absent	absent	absent	Corboud, 2009: 24, fig. 25–27
Sion 24	(192)	(94)	slab, inverted trapezoid	absent	Fingers, dagger, relief worn	belt with zigzag pattern , dagger	2 daggers		absent	Corboud, 2009: 26, fig. 28–30

						r				
Sion 27 phase 1	(91)	(44)	slab	absent	Arms, fingers		band with suspended fringe	absent	?	Corboud, 2009: 59–61, fig. 72–76
Sion 29	256	177	slab, inverted trapezoid with a small head protrusion	–	very worn	very worn	very worn	very worn	very worn	Corboud, 2009: 35–36, fig. 38–39